arXiv:1612.07274v1 [math.AP] 21 Dec 2016

Obstacle problem for evolution equations involving measure data and operator corresponding to semi-Dirichlet form

Tomasz Klimsiak

Abstract

In the paper we consider obstacle problem, with one and two irregular barriers, for semilinear evolution equation involving measure data and operator corresponding to s semi-Dirichlet form. We prove the existence and uniquueness of solutions under the assumption that the right-hand side of the equation is monotone and satisfies mild integrability conditions. To treat the case of irregular barriers, we extend the theory of precise version of a function introduced by M. Pierre. We also give some applications to so-called switching problem.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 35K86, 35K87.

1 Introduction

Let E be a locally compact separable metric space, m be a Radon measure on E with full support, and let $\{B^{(t)}, t \geq 0\}$ be a family of regular semi-Dirichlet forms on $L^2(E;m)$ with common domain V satisfying some regularity conditions. By L_t denote the operator corresponding to the form $B^{(t)}$. In the present paper we study the obstacle problem with one and two irregular barriers. In the case of one barrier $h : E \to \mathbb{R}$ it can be stated as follows: for given $\varphi : E \to \mathbb{R}$, $f : [0,T] \times E \to \mathbb{R}$ and smooth (with respect to the parabolic capacity Cap associated with $\{B^{(t)}, t \geq 0\}$) measure μ on $E_{0,T} \equiv [0,T) \times E$ find $u : \bar{E}_{0,T} \equiv [0,T] \times E \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - L_t u = f(\cdot,u) + \mu & \text{on the set } \{u > h\}, \quad u(T,\cdot) = \varphi, \\ -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - L_t u \geq f(\cdot,u) + \mu & \text{on } E_{0,T}, \\ u \geq h. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

In the second part of the paper we show how the results on (1.1) can be used to solve some system of variational inequalities associated with so-called switching problem.

Problems of the form (1.1) are at present quite well investigated in the case where L_t are local operators. Classical results for one or two regular barriers and L^2-integrable data are to be found in the monograph [1]. Semilinear obstacle problem with uniformly elliptic divergent form operators L_t and one or two irregular barriers was studied carefully in [12, 13] in case of L^2-data, and in [19] in case of measure data. In an important paper [29] linear problem (1.1) with one irregular barrier, L^2-data and operators L_t associated with Dirichlet forms is considered. The aim of the present paper is to generalize or strengthen the existing results in the sense we consider semilinear equations

T. Klimsiak: Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Śniadeckich 8, 00-956 Warszawa, Poland, and Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Chopina 12/18, 87-100 Toruń, Poland. E-mail: tomas@mat.umk.pl

involving measure data with two barriers and wide class of operators corresponding to semi-Dirichlet forms. As for the obstacles, we only assume that they are quasi-càdlàg functions satisfying mild integrability conditions. The class of quasi-càdlàg functions is very natural for evolution equations it includes quasi-continuous functions and parabolic potentials (which in general are not quasi-continuous).

When considering problem (1.1) with measure data, one of the first difficulties one encounters is the proper definition of a solution. Because of measure data, the usual variational approach is not applicable. Moreover, even in the case of L^2-data, the variational inequalities approach does not give uniqueness of solutions (see [24]). Therefore, following [29] and [19], we consider so-called complementary system associated with (1.1). Roughly speaking, by a solution of this system we mean a pair (u,ν) consisting of a quasi-càdlàg function $u : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a positive smooth measure ν on $E_{0,T}$ such that

$$-\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - L_t u = f(\cdot,u) + \nu + \mu \quad \text{on } E_{0,T}, \quad u(T,\cdot) = \varphi \quad \text{in } E, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\text{“}\nu \text{ is minimal”}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$u \geq h \quad \text{q.e.}, \tag{1.4}$$

where q.e. means quasi-everywhere with respect to the capacity Cap. Of course, in the above formulation one has to give rigorous meaning to (1.2) and (1.3). As for (1.2), we develop some ideas from the paper [14] devoted to evolution equations involving measure data and operators associated with semi-Dirichlet forms.

In the paper we assume that μ belongs to the class $\mathbb{M}$ of smooth Borel measures with finite potential, which under additional assumption of duality for the family $\{B^{(t)}, t \geq 0\}$, takes the form

$$\mathbb{M} = \bigcup_{\rho} \mathcal{M}_\rho,$$

where $\mathcal{M}_\rho$ denotes the set of all smooth signed measures on $E_{0,T}$ such that $\|\mu\|_\rho = \int_E \rho\, d\mu < \infty$, and the union is taken over all strictly positive excessive functions ρ.

If $\nu \in \mathbb{M}$, then we define a solution of (1.2) as in [14]. To formulate this definition, denote by $\mathbf{M}$ a Hunt process $\{(\mathbf{X}_t)_{t\geq 0}, (P_z)_{z\in E_{0,T}}\}$ with life time ζ associated with the operator $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + L_t$, and set $\zeta_\upsilon = \zeta \wedge (T - \upsilon(0))$, where υ is the uniform motion to the right, i.e. $\upsilon(t) = \upsilon(0) + t$ and $\upsilon(0) = s$ under P_z with $z = (s,x)$. By A^μ, A^ν denote natural additive functionals of $\mathbf{M}$ in the Revuz correspondence with μ and ν, respectively. By a solution of (1.2) we mean a function u such that for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$,

$$u(z) = E_z\Big(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_\upsilon}) + \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} f(\mathbf{X}_r, u(\mathbf{X}_r))\, dr + \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} dA^\mu_r + \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} dA^\nu_r\Big). \tag{1.5}$$

Formula (1.5) may be viewed as a nonlinear Feynman-Kac formula.

Unfortunately, in general, the “reaction measure” ν need not belong to $\mathbb{M}$ (in fact, as shown in [13], in case of two barriers, it may be a nowhere Radon measure). In such case we say that u satisfies (1.2) if u is of class (D), i.e. there is a natural potential (see [2]) dominating $|u|$, and there exists a local martingale additive functional M of $\mathbf{M}$ such that the following stochastic equation is satisfied under the measure P_z for q.e.

$z \in E_{0,T}$:

$$u(\mathbf{X}_t) = \varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) + \int_t^{\zeta_v} f(\mathbf{X}_r, u(\mathbf{X}_r))\, dr + \int_t^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{\mu} + \int_t^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{\nu} - \int_t^{\zeta_v} dM_r, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v]. \tag{1.6}$$

In the above definition the requirement that u is of class (D) is very important. The reason is that (1.6) is also satisfied by functions solving equation (1.6) with additional nontrivial singular (with respect to Cap) measure on its right-hand side (see [16]). These functions are not of class (D).

If $\nu \in \mathbb{M}$ then (1.6) is equivalent to (1.5). Furthermore, if the time dependent Dirichlet form $\mathcal{E}^{0,T}$ on $L^2(E_{0,T}; m_1 := dt \otimes m)$ determined by the family $\{B^{(t)}, t \geq 0\}$ has the dual Markov property and $\varphi \in L^1(E; m)$, $f(\cdot, u) \in L^1(E_{0,T}; dt \otimes m)$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}_1$ (i.e. μ, ν are bounded), then the solution u in the sense of (1.5) is a renormalized solution of (1.2) in the sense defined in [20]. In particular, this means that u has some further regularity properties and may be defined in purely analytical terms. More precisely, u is a renormalized solution if the truncations $T_k u = -k \vee (u \wedge k)$ of u belong to the space $L^2(0, T; V)$, and there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_k\} \subset \mathcal{M}_1$ such that $\|\lambda_k\|_1 \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and for every bounded $v \in L^2(0, T; V)$ such that $\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} \in L^2(0, T; V')$ and $v(0) = 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}^{0,T}(T_k u, v) = (T_k \varphi, v(T))_{L^2} + (f(\cdot, u), v)_{L^2} + \int_{E_{0,T}} v\, d\mu + \int_{E_{0,T}} v\, d\nu_k \tag{1.7}$$

for all $k \geq 0$. In case of local operators of Leray-Lions type the above definition of renormalized solutions was proposed in [28] (for the case of elliptic equations see [3]).

We now turn to condition (1.3). Intuitively, it means that ν "acts only if necessary". If h is quasi-continuous, this statement means that ν acts only when $u = h$, because then the right formulation of the minimality condition takes the form

$$\int_{E_{0,T}} (u - h)\, d\nu = 0 \tag{1.8}$$

(see [19, 29]). If h is only quasi-càdlàg, the situation is more subtle. For such h the function u satisfying (1.5) is also quasi-càdlàg, so the left-hand side of (1.8) is well defined, because ν is a smooth measure. However, in general, the left-hand side is strictly positive. M. Pierre has shown (in the case of linear equations with L^2-data and Dirichlet forms), that for general barrier h the condition

$$\int_{E_{0,T}} (\tilde{u} - \tilde{h})\, d\nu = 0 \tag{1.9}$$

is satisfied. Here $\tilde{u}$ is a precise m_1-version of u and $\tilde{h}$ is an associated precise version of h. The notions of a precise m_1-version of a potential and an associated precise version of a function h dominated by a potential (which is not necessarily m_1-version of h) were introduced in [29, 30]. In the paper, in case of semi-Dirichlet forms, we use probabilistic methods to introduce another notion of a precise m_1-version $\hat{u}$ of a quasi-càdlàg function u (note that potentials are quasi-càdlàg). Since our barriers as well as

solutions to (1.2)–(1.4) are quasi-càdlàg, we do not need the notion of an associated precise version. We show that if u is an L^2 potential, then

$$\hat{u} = \tilde{u} \quad \text{q.e,}$$

and for any quasi-càdlàg function u which is dominated by an L^2 potential,

$$\hat{u} \leq \tilde{u} \quad \text{q.e.,} \quad \int (\tilde{u} - \hat{u})\, d\nu = 0.$$

It follows in particular that in case of L^2 data and Dirichlet form, (1.9) is equivalent to

$$\int_{E_{0,T}} (\hat{u} - \hat{h})\, d\nu = 0 \tag{1.10}$$

One reason why we introduce a new notion of a precise version is that it is applicable to wider classes of operators and functions then those considered in [29, 30]. The second is that our definition is more direct that the construction of a precise version given in [29, 30]. Namely, in our approach by a precise version of a quasi-càdlàg function u on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ we mean a function $\hat{u}$ on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ such that for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$,

$$\hat{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) = u(\mathbf{X})_{t-}\,, \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\upsilon] \quad \text{on} \quad \{T - \upsilon(0) < \zeta\} \quad P_z\text{-a.s.}$$

As a consequence, our definition appears to be very convenient for studying obstacle problems and may be applied to quite general class of equations (possibly nonlinear with measure data and two obstacles).

In case of one obstacle, the main result of the paper says that if $\varphi, f(\cdot, 0)$ satisfy mild integrability conditions, and f is monotone and continuous with respect to u, then for every $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ there exists a unique solution (u, ν) of (1.1), i.e. a unique pair (u, ν) consisting of a quasi-càdlàg function u on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ and positive smooth measure ν on $E_{0,T}$ such that (1.6), (1.10) and (1.4) are satisfied. We also give conditions under which $\nu \in \mathbb{M}$ or $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, i.e. when equivalent to (1.6) formulations (1.5) or (1.7) may be used. Moreover, we show that $u_n \nearrow u$ q.e., where u_n is a solution of the following Cauchy problem

$$-\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial t} - L_t u_n = f(\cdot, u_n) + n(u_n - h)^- + \mu, \quad u_n(T, \cdot) = \varphi. \tag{1.11}$$

Our probabilistic approach allows us to prove similar results also for two quasi-càdlàg barriers h_1, h_2 satisfying some separation condition. In the case of two barriers, the measure ν appearing in the definition of a solution is a signed smooth measure. Moreover, we replace the minimality condition (1.9) by

$$\int_{E_{0,T}} (\hat{u} - \hat{h}_1)\, d\nu^+ = \int_{E_{0,T}} (\hat{h}_2 - \hat{u})\, d\nu^- = 0, \tag{1.12}$$

and replace condition (1.4) by $h_1 \leq u \leq h_2$ q.e. We show that under the same conditions on φ, f, μ as in the case of one barrier, there exists a unique solution (u, ν) of the obstacle problem with two barriers. We also show that $\bar{u}_n \nearrow u$ and $\lambda_n \nearrow \nu^-$, where $(\bar{u}_n, \lambda_n)$ is a solution of problem of the form (1.1), but with one upper barrier h_2 and f replaced by

$$f_n(t, x, y) = f(t, x, y) + n(y - h_1(t, x))^-.$$

We prove these results under two different separation conditions. The first one, more general, may be viewed as some analytical version of the Mokobodzki condition considered in the literature devoted to reflected stochastic differential equations (see, e.g., [15]). The second one, which is simpler and usually easier to check, as yet, has not been considered in the literature on evolution equations. It says that

$$h_1 < h_2, \quad \hat{h}_1 < \hat{h}_2 \quad \text{q.e.} \tag{1.13}$$

If h_1, h_2 are quasi-continuous, then (1.13) reduces to the condition $h_1 < h_2$ q.e., because quasi-continuous functions are precise (see [13] for this case).

In the last part of the paper we use our results on (1.1) to study so-called switching problem (see Section 7). This problem is closely related to system of quasi-variational inequalities, which when written as a complementary system, has the form

$$-\frac{\partial u^j}{\partial t} - L_t u^j = f^j(t,x,u) + \nu^j + \mu^j, \tag{1.14}$$

$$\int_{E_{0,T}} (\hat{u}^j - \hat{H}^j(\cdot,u))\, d\nu^j = 0, \tag{1.15}$$

$$u^j \geq H^j(\cdot,u) \quad \text{q.e.}, \tag{1.16}$$

where

$$H^j(z,y) = \max_{i \in A_j} h_{j,i}(z,y^i), \quad z \in E_{0,T},\ y \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

In (1.14)–(1.16), we are given $f^j : E_{0,T} \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$, $h_{j,i} : E_{0,T} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $\mu^j \in \mathbb{M}$ and sets $A_j \subset \{1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, N\}$, and we are looking for a pair $(u,\nu) = ((u^1, \dots, u^N), (\nu^1, \dots, \nu^N))$ satisfying (1.14)–(1.16) for $j = 1, \dots, N$. Note that in (1.16) the barrier H^j depends on u.

Systems of the form (1.14)–(1.16) were subject to numerous investigations, but only in the framework of viscosity solutions and for local operators (see [5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 10, 23]) or for special class of nonlocal operators associated with random Poisson measure (see [22]). In the paper we prove an existence result for (1.14)–(1.16). In the important special case where

$$h_{j,i}(z,y) = -c_{j,i}(z) + y^i$$

we show that there is a unique solution of (1.14)–(1.16), and moreover, that u is the value function for the optimal switching problem related to (1.14)–(1.16).

2 Preliminaries

In the paper E is a locally compact separable metric space and m a Radon measure on E such that $\operatorname{supp}[m] = E$. For $T > 0$ we set $E_{0,T} = [0,T) \times E$, $\bar{E}_{0,T} = [0,T] \times E$.

Recall (see [25]) that a form (B,V) is called semi-Dirichlet on $L^2(E;m)$ if V is a dense linear subspace of $L^2(E;m)$, B is a bilinear form on $V \times V$, and the following conditions (B1)–(B4) are satisfied:

(B1) B is lower bounded, i.e. there exists $\alpha_0 \geq 0$ such that $B_{\alpha_0}(u,u) \geq 0$ for $u \in V$, where $B_{\alpha_0}(u,v) = \mathcal{E}(u,v) + \alpha_0(u,v)$,

(B2) B satisfies the sector condition, i.e. there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$|B(u,v)| \leq K B_{\alpha_0}(u,u)^{1/2} B_{\alpha_0}(v,v)^{1/2}, \quad u,v \in V,$$

(B3) B is closed, i.e. for every $\alpha > \alpha_0$ the space V equipped with the inner product $B_\alpha^{(s)}(u,v) = \frac{1}{2}(B_\alpha(u,v) + B_\alpha(v,u))$ is a Hilbert space,

(B4) B has the Markov property, i.e. for every $a \geq 0$, $B(u \wedge a, u \wedge a) \leq B(u \wedge a, u)$ for all $u \in V$.

Condition (B4) is called the Markov property, because it is equivalent to the fact that the semigroup $\{T_t, t \geq 0\}$ associated with (B, V) is sub-Markov (see [25, Theorem 1.1.5]). Recall that (B, V) is said to have the dual Markov property if

(B5) for every $a \geq 0$,
$$B(u \wedge a, u \wedge a) \leq B(u, u \wedge a), \quad u \in V.$$

Note that (B5) is equivalent to the fact that the dual semigroup $\{\hat{T}_t, t \geq 0\}$ associated with (B, V) is sub-Markov (see [25, Theorem 1.1.5]). For the notions of transiency and regularity see [25, Sections 1.2, 1.3].

In the paper $\{B^{(t)}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a family of regular semi-Dirichlet forms on $L^2(E; m)$ satisfying (B2), (B3) with some constants K, α_0 not depending on t. We also assume that for all $u, v \in F$ the mapping $\mathbb{R} \ni t \mapsto B^{(t)}(u,v)$ is measurable, and for some $\lambda \geq 1$,

$$\lambda^{-1} B^{(0)}(u,u) \leq B^{(t)}(u,u) \leq \lambda B^{(0)}(u,u), \quad u \in V, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$ denote the time-dependent semi-Dirichlet form associated with the family $\{B^{(t)}, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ (see [25, Section 6.1]), and Cap denote the associated capacity. We say the some property holds quasi-everywhere (q.e. for short) if it holds outside some exceptional set B, i.e. outside some set $B \subset \mathbb{R} \times E$ such $\mathrm{Cap}(B) = 0$.

Let μ be a signed measure on $\mathbb{R} \times E$. By $|\mu|$ we denote the variation of μ, i.e. $|\mu| = \mu^+ + \mu^-$, where μ^+ (resp. μ^-) denote the positive (resp. negative) part of μ. Recall that a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R} \times E$ is called smooth if μ charges no exceptional sets and there exists an increasing sequence $\{F_n\}$ of closed subsets of $\mathbb{R} \times E$ such that $|\mu|(F_n) < \infty$ for $n \geq 1$ and $\mathrm{Cap}(K \setminus F_n) \to 0$ for every compact $K \subset \mathbb{R} \times E$.

It is known (see [25, Section 6.3]) that there exists a unique Hunt process $\mathbf{M} = \{(\mathbf{X})_{t \geq 0}, (P_z)_{z \in \mathbb{R} \times E}\}$ with life time ζ associated with the form $(\mathcal{E}, D[\mathcal{E}])$. Moreover,

$$\mathbf{X}_t = (\upsilon(t), X_{\upsilon(t)}),$$

where υ is the uniform motion to the right, i.e. $\upsilon(t) = \upsilon(0) + t$ and $\upsilon(0) = s$, P_z-a.s. for $z = (s, x)$ (see [25, Theorem 6.3.1]). In the sequel, for fixed $T > 0$ we set

$$\zeta_\upsilon = \zeta \wedge (T - \upsilon(0)).$$

Recall (see [25, Section 6]) that there is one-to-one correspondence, called Revuz duality, between positive smooth measures and positive natural additive functionals (PNAFs) of $\mathbf{M}$. For a positive smooth measure μ we denote by A^μ the unique PNAF in the Revuz duality with μ. For a signed smooth measure μ we put $A^\mu = A^{\mu^+} - A^{\mu^-}$. For a fixed positive measurable function f and a positive Borel measure μ we denote by $f \cdot \mu$ the measure defined as

$$(f \cdot \mu)(\eta) = \int_{E_{0,T}} \eta f \, d\mu, \quad \eta \in \mathcal{B}^+(E_{0,T}).$$

By S_0 we denote the set of all measures of finite energy integrals, i.e. the set of all smooth measures μ having the property that there is $K \geq 0$ such that

$$\int_E |\tilde{\eta}|\, d|\mu| \leq K\|\eta\|_{\mathcal{W}}, \quad \eta \in \mathcal{W},$$

where $\tilde{\eta}$ is a quasi-continuous m_1-version of η (for the existence of such version see [25, Theorem 6.2.11]). By $\mathbb{M}$ we denote the set of all smooth measures on $E_{0,T}$ such that $E_z A^{|\mu|}_{\zeta_v} < \infty$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. $\mathbb{M}_c$ is the set of those $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ for which A^μ is continuous.

For a given positive smooth measure we set

$$R^{0,T}\mu(z) = E_z A^\mu_{\zeta_v}.$$

Set

$$\mathcal{V}_{0,T} = L^2(0,T;V), \qquad \mathcal{W}_{0,T} = \{u \in \mathcal{V}_{0,T} : \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \in \mathcal{V}'_{0,T}\},$$
$$\mathcal{W}_T = \{u \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T} : u(T) = 0\}, \qquad \mathcal{W}_0 = \{u \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T} : u(0) = 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}^{0,T}(u,v) = \begin{cases} \int_0^T \langle -\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}(t), v(t)\rangle\, dt + \int_0^T B^{(t)}(u(t),v(t))\, dt, & (u,v) \in \mathcal{W}_T \times \mathcal{V}_{0,T}, \\ \int_0^T \langle u(t), \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t)\rangle\, dt + \int_0^T B^{(t)}(u(t),v(t))\, dt, & (u,v) \in \mathcal{V}_{0,T} \times \mathcal{W}_0, \end{cases}$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the duality pairing between V' and V (V' stands for the dual of V). It is known (see [31, Example I.4.9(iii)]) that $\mathcal{E}^{0,T}$ is a generalized semi-Dirichlet form. The operator associated with $\mathcal{E}^{0,T}$ has the form

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - L_t, \quad D(\mathcal{L}) = \{u \in \mathcal{W}_T : \mathcal{L}u \in L^2(E_{0,T}; m_1)\},$$

where $(L_t, D(D_t))$ is the operator associated with $(B^{(t)}, V)$, $t \in [0,T]$. By $(G^{0,T}_\alpha)_{\alpha>0}$ we denote the (unique) strongly continuous contraction resolvent on $L^2(0,T;L^2(E;m))$ associated with $\mathcal{E}^{0,T}$ (see Propositions I.3.4 and I.3.6 in [31]).

3 Precise versions of quasi-càdlàg functions

3.1 Precise versions of parabolic potentials in the sense of Pierre and its probabilistic interpretation

We first recall the notion of a precise version of a parabolic potential introduced in [30].

Definition. A measurable function $u \in \mathcal{V}_{0,T} \cap L^\infty(0,T;L^2(E;m))$ is called a parabolic potential if for every nonnegative $v \in \mathcal{W}_0$,

$$\int_0^T \left\langle \frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t), u(t) \right\rangle dt + \int_0^T B^{(t)}(u(t),v(t))\, dt \geq 0.$$

The set of all parabolic potentials will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}^2$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$. Then there exists a unique $\mu \in S_0$ such that*

$$u(z) = E_z A^\mu_{\zeta_v} \tag{3.1}$$

for m_1-a.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$.

Proof. By [30, Proposition I.5] there exists a measure $\mu \in S_0$ such that

$$\int_t^T (\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}(t), u(t))\, dt + \int_t^T B^{(t)}(u(t), v(t))\, dt = \int_{(t,T]\times E} v\, d\mu - (v(t), u(t))_{L^2}$$

for all $v \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T}$ and $t \in [0,T]$. This and [14, Theorem 3.7] yield (3.1). □

In the sequel, for $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$ we set $\mathcal{E}(u) = \mu$, where $\mu \in S_0$ is the measure from Proposition 3.1.

Definition. A measurable function u on $E_{0,T}$ is called precise (in the sense of M. Pierre) if there exists a sequence $\{u_n\}$ of quasi-continuous parabolic potentials such that $u_n \searrow u$ q.e. on $E_{0,T}$.

The following result has been proved in [30].

Theorem 3.2. *Each $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$ has a precise m_1-version.*

In what follows we denote by $\tilde{u}$ a precise version of $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$ in the sense of Pierre. It is clear that $\tilde{u}$ it is defined q.e. In [30] it is proved that the mapping $t \mapsto \tilde{u}(t,\cdot) \in L^2(E;m)$ is left continuous and has right limits, whereas in [14] it is proved that u defined by (3.1) has the property that the mapping $t \mapsto u(t,\cdot) \in L^2(E;m)$ is right continuous and has left limits. Since for any $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ and $t \in [0,T]$, $\mathrm{Cap}(\{t\}\times B) = 0$ if and only if $m(B) = 0$, it follows that in general $\mathrm{Cap}(\{u \neq \tilde{u}\}) > 0$. In the sequel, for given $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$ we will also consider its version defined by (3.1).

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $\{x_n\}$ is a decreasing sequence of càglàd functions on $[0,T]$ such that $x_n(t) \searrow x(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$, and $x(t) = -a(t) + b(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$, for some nondecreasing function a and càglàd function b on $[0,T]$. Then a and x are càglàd functions.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of [27, Lemma 2.2], so we omit it. □

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$Y_t^n = Y_0^n - A_t^n + M_t^n, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{3.2}$$

where A^n is a predictable increasing square integrable process with $A_0^n = 0$, and M^n is a square integrable martingale with $M_0^n = 0$. If $Y_t^n \searrow Y_t$, $t \in [0,T]$, and $E\sup_{t\le T}(|Y_t^1|^2 + |Y_t|^2) < \infty$, then $\hat{Y}_t := \lim_{n\to\infty} Y_{t-}^n$, $t \in [0,T]$, is a càglàd process.

Proof. By [21, Theorem 3.1],

$$E|A^n|_T^2 + E[M^n]_T \le cE \sup_{t\in[0,T]} |Y_t^n|^2 \le cE \sup_{t\in[0,T]} (|Y_t^n|^2 \wedge |Y_t|^2).$$

In particular, $\sup_n E|M_T^n|^2 < \infty$. Therefore there exists $X \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$ such that $M_T^n \to X$ weakly in $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Let N be a càdlàg version of $E(X|\mathcal{F}_t)$, $t \in [0,T]$. Then for every $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $M_\tau^n \to N_\tau$ weakly in $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$. Indeed, if $Z \in L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} EM_\tau^n Z = E(E(M_T^n|\mathcal{F}_\tau)\cdot Z) &= E(M_T^n E(Z|\mathcal{F}_\tau)) \\ &\to EXE(Z|\mathcal{F}_\tau) = E(E(X|\mathcal{F}_\tau)Z) = EN_\tau \cdot Z. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Since the filtration $\mathcal{F}$ is quasi-left continuous, each $\mathcal{F}$-martingale M has the property that $M_{\tau-} = M_\tau$ for all predictable $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. Therefore for any predictable $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$A^n_{\tau-} = Y^n_0 - Y^n_{\tau-} + M^n_{\tau-} = Y^n_0 - Y^n_{\tau-} + M^n_\tau. \tag{3.4}$$

Set

$$\hat{A}_t = Y_0 - \hat{Y}_t + N_{t-}, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

Of course, $\hat{A}$ is predictable. By (3.3) and (3.4), for any predictable $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$A^n_{\tau-} \to Y_0 - \hat{Y}_\tau + N_\tau = Y_0 - \hat{Y}_\tau + N_{\tau-} = \hat{A}_\tau$$

weakly in $L^2(\mathcal{F}_T)$. From the above convergence, $\hat{A}_\sigma \le \hat{A}_\tau$ for all predictable $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\sigma \le \tau$. Therefore applying the predictable cross-section theorem (see [4, [Theorem 86, p. 138]) we conclude that $\hat{A}$ is an increasing process. Consequently, by Lemma 3.3, $\hat{Y}$ is càglàd. □

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section. In the sequel, for a function u on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ we set $u(\mathbf{X})_{t-} = Y_{t-}$ and $u(\mathbf{X})_{t+} = Y_{t+}$, where $Y_t = u(\mathbf{X}_t)$, $t \in (0,T]$.

Theorem 3.5. *Assume that $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$. Then for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$,*

$$\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) = u(\mathbf{X})_{t-}, \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\upsilon], \quad P_z\text{-a.s.} \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. By the definition of a precise version of a potential, there exists a sequence $\{u_n\}$ of quasi-continuous parabolic potentials such that $u_n \searrow \tilde{u}$ q.e. on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$. Since $u_n, u \in \mathcal{P}^2$, then by Proposition 3.1 and the strong Markov property there exist measures $\mu_n, \mu \in \mathbb{M}$ and square integrable martingales M^n, M such that

$$u_n(\mathbf{X}_t) = \int_t^{\zeta_\tau} dA^{\mu_n}_r - \int_t^{\zeta_\tau} dM^n_r, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_\tau]$$

and

$$u(\mathbf{X}_t) = \int_t^{\zeta_\tau} dA^{\mu}_r - \int_t^{\zeta_\tau} dM_r, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_\tau]. \tag{3.6}$$

By [26], $E|A^{\mu_n}_{\zeta_\upsilon}|^2 + E|A^{\mu}_{\zeta_\upsilon}|^2 < \infty$. Since $u_n \searrow \tilde{u}$ q.e. on $E_{0,T}$, we have

$$u_n(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) \searrow \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}), \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\tau], \quad P_z\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. But $u_n(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) = u_n(\mathbf{X})_{t-}$, $t \in (0, \zeta_\tau]$, P_z-a.s. for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, because u_n is quasi-continuous. Therefore applying Lemma 3.4 shows that $\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-})$ is càglàd. We are going to show that

$$\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_-)_{t+} = u(\mathbf{X}_t), \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\tau). \tag{3.7}$$

Since $\tilde{u} = u$ m_1-a.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = R^{0,T}|\tilde{u} - u|(z) &= E_z \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} |\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_t) - u(\mathbf{X}_t)|\, dt \\ &= E_z \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} |\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) - u(\mathbf{X}_t)|\, dt = E_z \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} |(\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_-)_{t+} - u(\mathbf{X}_t)|\, dt \end{aligned}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Hence

$$\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_-)_{t+} = u(\mathbf{X}_t) \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in (0, \zeta_\tau) \tag{3.8}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Since $\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_-)_{t+}$ and $u(\mathbf{X}_t)$ are càdlàg processes, (3.8) implies (3.7). In turn, (3.7) implies (3.5), because $\tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_-)$ is càglàd. □

3.2 Probabilistic approach to precise versions of quasi-càdlàg functions

Definition. We say that $u : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is quasi-càdlàg if the process $u(\mathbf{X})$ is càdlàg on $[0, \zeta_\upsilon]$ under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$.

Of course, any quasi-continuous function is quasi-càdlàg. Recall that a function u is called natural potential if there exists a positive measure $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ such that

$$u(z) = E_z A^\mu_{\zeta_\upsilon}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. By Proposition 3.1, each $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$ is a natural potential. By [14, Proposition 3.4], each natural potential is quasi-càdlàg.

Theorem 3.6. *Let u be a quasi-càdlàg function on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$. Then there exists a unique (q.e.) function $\hat{u}$ such that for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$,*

$$\hat{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) = u(\mathbf{X})_{t-}\,, \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\upsilon] \quad \text{on} \quad \{T - \upsilon(0) < \zeta\}, \quad P_z\text{-a.s.} \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. By [25, Theorem 3.3.6] there exists a measure $\hat{m}_1$ equivalent to m_1 such that $(\mathbf{X}, P_z)$ has the dual Hunt process $(\hat{\mathbf{X}}, \hat{P}_z)$ with respect to $\hat{m}_1$. Therefore by [7, Theorem 16.4] applied to the process $u(X)_-$ there exists a Borel measurable function $\hat{u}$ satisfying (3.9). Uniqueness follows from the very definition of exceptional sets and [7, Proposition 11.1]. □

Definition. For a quasi-càdlàg function u on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ we call the function $\hat{u}$ from Theorem 3.6 a precise m_1-version of u.

Corollary 3.7. *For $u \in \mathcal{P}^2$, $\tilde{u} = \hat{u}$ q.e.*

Remark 3.8. It is clear that $\hat{u}$ is an m_1-version of u (see the reasoning before (3.8)).

In the sequel we will need the following result.

Proposition 3.9. *Let μ be a positive smooth measure on $E_{0,T}$, and let u be a positive quasi-càdlàg function on $E_{0,T}$. Then*

$$\int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} [u(\mathbf{X})]_{t-}\, dA^\mu_t = \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} \hat{u}(\mathbf{X}_t)\, dA^\mu_t\,, \quad P_z\text{-a.s.} \tag{3.10}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Moreover,

$$E_z \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} u(\mathbf{X}_t)\, dA^\mu_t = 0 \quad \text{for q.e.} \quad z \in E_{0,T}$$

if and only if $\int_{E_{0,T}} u\, d\mu = 0$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.6, $\int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} [u(\mathbf{X})]_{t-}\, dA^\mu_t = \int_0^{\zeta_\upsilon} \hat{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-})\, dA^\mu_t$, P_z-a.s. It is well known that $\mathbf{X}$ has only totally inaccessible jumps, which combined with the fact that A^μ is predictable gives (3.10). The second part of the proposition follows directly from the Revuz duality. □

3.3 Associated precise versions in the sense of Pierre

Let u be a measurable function on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ bounded by some element of $\mathcal{W}$. In [29] M. Pierre introduced so called associated precise m_1-version $\tilde{u}$ of u. By the definition, $\tilde{u}$ is the unique quasi-l.s.c. function such that

$$\{v \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T} + \mathcal{P}^2 : \tilde{v} \geq u \text{ q.e.}\} = \{v \in \mathcal{W}_{0,T} + \mathcal{P}^2 : \tilde{v} \geq \tilde{u} \text{ q.e.}\}$$

In general, it is not true that $\tilde{u} = u$ m_1-a.e. However, if u is quasi-càdlàg, then

$$\hat{u} \leq \tilde{u} \quad \text{q.e.} \tag{3.11}$$

Indeed, by [29, Proposition IV-I] there exists a sequence $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{W}_{0,T}$ such that $\inf_{n\geq 1} u_n = \tilde{u}$ q.e. Since $u \leq u_n$ q.e. and u is quasi-càdlàg, we have

$$u(\mathbf{X}_t) \leq u_n(\mathbf{X}_t), \quad t \in [0, \zeta_\upsilon],$$

which implies

$$\hat{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) = u(\mathbf{X})_{t-} \leq u_n(\mathbf{X})_{t-} = u_n(\mathbf{X}_{t-}), \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\upsilon] \quad \text{on} \quad \{T - \upsilon(0) < \zeta\}.$$

Taking infimum, we get

$$\hat{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}) \leq \tilde{u}(\mathbf{X}_{t-}), \quad t \in (0, \zeta_\upsilon].$$

By the above and [7, Proposition 11.1] we get (3.11).

4 Reflected BSDEs

In what follows $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ is a probability space, $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a filtration satisfying the usual conditions, and T is an arbitrary, but fixed bounded $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time. By $\mathcal{T}$ we denote the set of all $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times with values in $[0, T]$. For $\sigma, \gamma \in [0, T]$ such that $\sigma \leq \gamma$ we denote by $\mathcal{T}_\gamma$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}_{\sigma,\gamma}$) the set of all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $P(\tau \in [\gamma, T]) = 1$ (resp. $P(\tau \in [\sigma, \gamma]) = 1$).

By $\mathcal{M}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{loc}$) we denote the space of martingales (resp. local martingales) with respect to $\mathbb{F}$. $[M]$ denotes the quadratic variation process of $M \in \mathcal{M}_{loc}$. By $\mathcal{M}_0$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}^p$) we denote the subspace of $\mathcal{M}$ consisting of all M such that $M_0 = 0$ (resp. $E[M]_T^{p/2} < \infty$).

By $\mathcal{V}$ (resp. $\mathcal{V}^+$) we denote the space of all $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes (resp. increasing processes) V of finite variation such that $V_0 = 0$. $\mathcal{V}^p$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{V}$ consisting of V such that $E|V|_T^p < \infty$, where $|V|_t$ denotes the variation of V on the interval $[0, t]$. ${}^p\mathcal{V}$ is the space of all predictable processes in $\mathcal{V}$.

By $\mathcal{S}^p$ we denote the space of $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes Y such that $E \sup_{t\leq T} |Y_t|^p < \infty$. $L^p(\mathcal{F})$ is the space of $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable processes X such that $E \int_0^T |X_t|^p \, dt < \infty$. $L^p(\mathcal{F}_T)$ is the space of $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variables X such that $E|X|^p < \infty$.

Let $f : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that $f(\cdot, y)$ is $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$, ξ be a $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random variable and V be a càdlàg process of finite variation such that $V_0 = 0$.

Definition. We say that a pair of processes (Y, M) is a solution of the backward stochastic differential equation with terminal condition ξ and right-hand side $f + dV$ (BSDE$(\xi, f + dV)$ for short) if

(a) Y is an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process of Doob's class (D), $M \in \mathcal{M}_{0,loc}$,

(b) $[0,T] \ni t \to f(t, Y_t) \in L^1(0,T)$ and

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^T dV_r - \int_t^T dM_r, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Let L, U be two càdlàg $\mathbb{F}$-adapted processes such that $L_t \le U_t$, $t \in [0,T]$, and $L_T \le \xi \le U_T$.

Definition. We say that a triple of processes (Y, M, K) is a solution of the reflected backward stochastic differential equation with terminal condition ξ, right-hand side $f + dV$ and lower barrier L ($\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(\xi, f + dV, L)$ for short) if

(a) Y is an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process of Doob's class (D), $M \in \mathcal{M}_{0,loc}$, $K \in {}^p\mathcal{V}^+$,

(b) $Y_t \ge L_t$, $t \in [0,T]$,

(c) $\int_0^T (Y_{t-} - L_{t-})\, dK_t = 0$, P-a.s.,

(d) $[0,T] \ni t \to f(t, Y_t) \in L^1(0,T)$ and

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^T dV_r + \int_t^T dK_r - \int_t^T dM_r, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Definition. We say that a triple of processes (Y, M, K) is a solution of the reflected backward stochastic differential equation with terminal condition ξ, right-hand side $f + dV$ and upper barrier L ($\overline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(\xi, f + dV, U)$ for short) if the triple $(-Y, -M, K)$ is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(-\xi, \tilde{f} - dV, -L)$, where $\tilde{f}(t, y) = -f(t, -y)$.

Definition. We say that a triple of processes (Y, M, R) is a solution of the reflected BSDE with terminal condition ξ, right-hand side $f + dV$, lower barrier L and upper barrier U (RBSDE$(\xi, f + dV, L, U)$ for short) if

(a) Y is an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted càdlàg process of class (D), $M \in \mathcal{M}_{0,loc}$, $R \in {}^p\mathcal{V}$,

(b) $L_t \le Y_t \le U_t$, $t \in [0,T]$, P-a.s.

(c) $\int_0^T (Y_{t-} - L_{t-})\, dR_t^+ = \int_0^T (U_{t-} - Y_{t-})\, dR_t^- = 0$, P-a.s.

(d) $[0,T] \ni t \mapsto f(t, Y_t) \in L^1(0,T)$ and

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^T dV_r + \int_t^T dR_r - \int_t^T dM_r, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad P\text{-a.s.}$$

Remark 4.1. Observe that if (Y, M, K) is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(\xi, f + dV, L)$ and $A \in {}^p\mathcal{V}^+$ has the property that $dA \le dK$, then the triple $(Y, M, K - A)$ is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(\xi, f + dV + dA, L)$.

In the sequel we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that*

(i) *there is* $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that for a.e.* $t \in [0,T]$ *and all* $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$(f(t,y) - f(t,y'))(y - y') \le \mu |y - y'|^2,$$

(ii) $[0,T] \ni t \mapsto f(t,y) \in L^1(0,T)$ *for every* $y \in \mathbb{R}$,

(iii) $\mathbb{R} \ni y \mapsto f(t,y)$ *is continuous for a.e.* $t \in [0,T]$,

(iv) $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T)$, $V \in \mathcal{V}^1$, $f(\cdot,0) \in L^1(\mathcal{F})$.

Let $f_n = f \vee (-n)$, *and let* (Y^n, M^n, R^n) *be a solution of* RBSDE$(\xi, f_n + dV, L, U)$. *Then*

$$Y^n_t \searrow Y_t, \quad M^n_t \to M_t, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad dR^{+,n} \nearrow dR^+, \quad dR^{-,n} \searrow dR^-,$$

where (Y, M, R) *is a solution of* RBSDE$(\xi, f + dV, L, U)$.

Proof. By [15, Proposition 2.14, Proposition 3.1, Theorem 3.3], $Y^n \ge Y^{n+1} \ge Y$, $dR^{+,n} \le dR^{+,n+1} \le dR^+$, $dR^{-,n} \ge dR^{-,n+1}$ for $n \ge 1$. Set $\bar{Y}_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} Y^n_t$, $K_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} R^{+,n}_t$, $A_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} R^{-,n}_t$, $\bar{R}_t = K_t - R_t$, $t \in [0,T]$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\mu \le 0$ in (i). Then

$$f(r, Y^1_r) \le f_n(r, Y^n_r) \le f_1(r, Y_r), \quad r \in [0,T].$$

From this we conclude that the sequence $\{M^n\}$ is locally uniformly integrable. Hence $\bar{M}_t := \lim_{n\to\infty} M^n_t$, $t \in [0,T]$, is a local martingale. We shall show that the triple $(\bar{Y}, \bar{M}, \bar{R})$ is a solution of RBSDE$(\xi, f + dV, L, U)$. It is clear that $\bar{R}$ is a càdlàg process of finite variation. Moreover, by (ii) and (iii),

$$\bar{Y}_t = \xi + \int_t^T f(r, \bar{Y}_r)\, dr + \int_t^T d\bar{R}_r + \int_t^T dV_r - \int_t^T d\bar{M}_r, \quad t \in [0,T].$$

It is also clear that $\bar{Y}$ is of class (D) and $L \le \bar{Y} \le U$. By the Hahn-Saks theorem,

$$\int_0^T (\bar{Y}_t - L_t)\, dK^c_t = \lim_{n\to\infty} \int_0^T (\bar{Y}_t - L_t)\, dR^{+,n,c}_t = 0. \tag{4.1}$$

Assume that $\Delta K_t > 0$. Then there exists n_0 such that $\Delta R^{+,n}_t > 0$ for $n \ge n_0$. Since $\int_0^T (Y^n_{t-} - L_{t-})\, dR^{+,n}_t = 0$ and $Y^n_t \ge L_t$, it follows that $Y^n_{t-} = L_{t-}$ for $n \ge n_0$. Consequently, $\bar{Y}_{t-} \le Y^n_{t-} = L_{t-}$, which implies that $\bar{Y}_{t-} = L_{t-}$. We have proved that $\sum_t (\bar{Y}_{t-} - L_{t-}) \Delta K_t = 0$, which when combined with (4.1) shows that

$$\int_0^T (\bar{Y}_{t-} - L_{t-})\, dK_t = 0.$$

Also observe that

$$\int_0^T (U_t - \bar{Y}_t)\, dA_t \le \int_0^T (U_t - Y^n_t)\, dR^{n,-}_t = 0.$$

Thus the triple $(\bar{Y}, \bar{M}, \bar{R})$ is a solution of RBSDE$(\xi, f + dV, L, U)$. From this and the minimality of the Jordan decomposition of the measure R it follows that $R^+ = K$, $R^- = A$. □

5 PDEs with one reflecting barrier

In this section $T > 0$ is a real number, $\varphi : E \to \mathbb{R}$, $f : \bar{E}_{0,T} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ are measurable functions, and $h : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a quasi-càdlàg function such that $h(T, \cdot) \le \varphi$.

Definition. We say that a quasi-càdlàg function u on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ is a solution of the Cauchy problem

$$-\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - L_t u = f(\cdot, u) + \mu, \quad u(T, \cdot) = \varphi$$

(PDE($\varphi, f + d\mu$) for short) if for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$,

$$u(z) = E_z \varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) + E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} f(\mathbf{X}_r, u(\mathbf{X}_r))\, dr + E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA^{\mu}_r.$$

Definition. We say that a pair (u, ν), where $u : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a quasi-càdlàg function and ν is a positive smooth measure on $E_{0,T}$, is a solution of problem (1.1), i.e. obstacle problem with data φ, f, μ and lower barrier h (we denote it by $\underline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h)$), if

(a) (1.6) is satisfied for some local martingale additive functional (local MAF) M of $\mathbf{M}$,

(b) $u \ge h$ q.e.,

(c) $\int_{E_{0,T}} (\hat{u} - \hat{h})\, d\nu = 0$.

Definition. We say that a pair (u, ν) is a solution of the obstacle problem with data φ, f, μ and upper barrier h (we denote it by $\overline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h)$), if $(-u, \nu)$ is a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(-\varphi, \tilde{f} - d\mu, -h)$, where $\tilde{f}(t, x, y) = -f(t, x, -y)$.

We will need the following duality condition considered in [14].

(Δ) For some $\alpha \ge 0$ there exists a nest $\{F_n\}$ on $E_{0,T}$ such that for every $n \ge 1$ there is a non-negative $\eta_n \in L^2(E_{0,T}; m_1)$ such that $\eta_n > 0$ m_1-a.e. on F_n and $\hat{G}^{0,T}_{\alpha} \eta_n$ is bounded, where $\hat{G}^{0,T}_{\alpha}$ is the adjoint operator to $G^{0,T}_{\alpha}$.

Note that (Δ) is satisfied if for some $\gamma \ge 0$ the form $\mathcal{E}_{\gamma}$ has the dual Markov property (see [14, Remark 3.9]).

Following [14] we say that $f : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is quasi-integrable if $f \in \mathcal{B}(E_{0,T})$ and $P_z(\int_0^{\zeta_\tau} |f|(\mathbf{X}_r)\, dr < \infty) = 1$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$.

The set of all quasi-integrable functions will be denoted by $qL^1(E_{0,T}; m_1)$. Note that by [14], under condition (Δ), if f satisfies the condition

$$\forall\, \varepsilon > 0\ \exists\, F_\varepsilon \subset E_{0,T},\ F_\varepsilon\text{-closed},\ \mathrm{Cap}(E_{0,T} \setminus F_\varepsilon) < \varepsilon,\ \mathbf{1}_{F_\varepsilon} f \in L^1(E_{0,T}; m_1), \tag{5.1}$$

then f is quasi-integrable. Also note that by [14], under condition (Δ),

$$\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathbb{M}.$$

We say that a function $u : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ is of class (D) if $(u(T, \cdot) \cdot m) \otimes \delta_{\{T\}} \in \mathbb{M}$ (here $\delta_{\{T\}}$ is the Dirac measure concentrated at T), and there exists a measure $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $|u| \le R^{0,T} \beta$ on $E_{0,T}$.

Remark 5.1. If u is of class (D), then the process $u(\mathbf{X})$ is of Doob's class (D) on $[0,\zeta_\upsilon]$, i.e. the family $\{u(\mathbf{X}_\tau),\, \tau\in\mathcal{T}\}$ is uniformly integrable under the measure P_z for q.e. $z\in E_{0,T}$. Indeed, it is an elementary check that

$$v(\mathbf{X}_t)=v(\mathbf{X}_0)-\int_0^t dA^\beta_r+\int_0^t dM_r,\quad t\in[0,\zeta_\upsilon]$$

for some MAF M, where $v=R^{0,T}\beta$. Of course, the process $v(\mathbf{X})$ is of class (D), and $|u|(\mathbf{X}_t)\le v(\mathbf{X}_t)$, $t\in[0,\zeta_\upsilon)$. Since $E_z|u|(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_\upsilon})<\infty$ for q.e. $z\in E_{0,T}$, it follows that $u(\mathbf{X})$ is of class (D), too.

Let us consider the following assumptions.

(H1) $\mu, f(\cdot,0)\cdot m_1,\, \varphi\cdot m\otimes\delta_{\{T\}}\in\mathbb{M}$,

(H2) there exists $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ such that for all $y,y'\in\mathbb{R}$ and $(t,x)\in E_{0,T}$,

$$(f(t,x,y)-f(t,x,y'))(y-y')\le\lambda|y-y'|^2,$$

(H3) the mapping $y\mapsto f(t,x,y)$ is continuous for every $(t,x)\in E_{0,T}$,

(H4) $f(\cdot,y)\in qL^1(E_{0,T};m_1)$ for every $y\in\mathbb{R}$,

(H5) h is of class (D).

Theorem 5.2. *Assume* (H2). *Then there exists at most one solution of* $\underline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(\varphi, f+d\mu, h)$.

Proof. Let (u_1,ν_1), (u_2,ν_2) be two solutions of $\underline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(\varphi,f+d\mu,h)$. Set $u=u_1-u_2$, $\nu=\nu_1-\nu_2$ By the Tanaka-Meyer formula, for any stopping time τ such that $\tau\le\zeta_\upsilon$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}|u(\mathbf{X}_t)|\le|u(\mathbf{X}_\tau)|&+\int_t^\tau(f(r,u_1(\mathbf{X}_r))-f(r,u_2(\mathbf{X}_r)))\mathrm{sgn}(u)(\mathbf{X}_r)\,dr\\&+\int_t^\tau\mathrm{sgn}(u)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\,dA^\nu_r-\int_t^\tau\mathrm{sgn}(u)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\,dM_r,\quad t\in[0,\tau]\end{aligned}$$

for q.e. $z\in E_{0,T}$. Observe that by the minimality condition and Proposition 3.9,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_t^\tau\mathrm{sgn}(u)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\,dA^\nu_r&=\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq0\}}\frac{1}{|u|}u(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\,dA^\nu_r\\&\le\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq0\}}\frac{1}{|u|}(u_1-h)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\,dA^{\nu_1}_r\\&=\int_t^\tau\mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq0\}}\frac{1}{|u|}(\hat u_1(\mathbf{X}_r)-\hat h(\mathbf{X}_r))\,dA^{\nu_1}_r=0.\end{aligned}\tag{5.2}$$

Let $\{\tau_k\}$ be a stationary sequence (i.e. $P(\liminf_{k\to\infty}\{\tau_k=T\})=1$) such that M^{τ_k} is a martingale for each $k\ge1$. Then by (H2) and (5.2),

$$E_z|u(\mathbf{X}_t)|\le E_z|u(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_k})|+\lambda E_z\int_t^{\tau_k}|u(\mathbf{X}_r)|\,dr.\tag{5.3}$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ in (5.3) and using the fact that u is of class (D) we get

$$E_z|u(\mathbf{X}_t)| \le \lambda E_z \int_t^{\zeta_v} |u(\mathbf{X}_r)|\, dr.$$

Applying Gronwall's lemma shows that $E_z|u|(\mathbf{X}_t)| = 0$, $t \in [0, \zeta_v]$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. This implies that $u = 0$ q.e. From this, (1.6) and the uniqueness of the Doob-Meyer decomposition we conclude that $A^\nu = 0$, which forces $\nu = 0$. □

Theorem 5.3. *Assume* (H1)–(H5). *Then there exists a solution of* $\underline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h)$.

Proof. By [14, Theorem 5.8] there exists a unique solution u_n of (1.11). Set

$$f_n(t, x, y) = f(t, x, y) + n(y - h(t, x))^-.$$

By the definition of a solution of (1.11) there exists a MAF M^n such that the pair $(u_n(\mathbf{X}), M^n)$ is a solution of BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}), f_n(\mathbf{X}, \cdot) + dA^\mu)$ under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. By [15, Theorem 4.1] there exists a solution (Y^z, M^z, K^z) of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}$BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}), f(\mathbf{X}, \cdot) + dA^\mu, h(\mathbf{X}))$ under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, and

$$u_n(\mathbf{X}_t) \nearrow Y_t^z, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v], \quad P_z\text{-a.s.} \tag{5.4}$$

From (5.4) it follows that $u_n \le u_{n+1}$ q.e. for $n \ge 1$ and

$$Y_t^z = u(\mathbf{X}_t), \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v], \quad P_z\text{-a.s.}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, where $u := \sup_{n \ge 1} u_n$. This implies that u is quasi-càdlàg. What is left to show that there exists a smooth measure ν such that $K^z = A^\nu$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Since the pointwise limit of additive functionals is an additive functional, we may assume by Lemma 4.2 and [15, Theorem 2.13] that $EK^z_{\zeta_v} < \infty$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. By [15, Proposition 4.3] and Theorem 3.6, for every predictable stopping time τ,

$$\Delta K_\tau^z = (u(\mathbf{X}_\tau) - \hat{h}(\mathbf{X}_\tau) + \Delta A_\tau^\mu)^-.$$

Hence

$$J_t = \sum_{s \le t} \Delta K_t^z$$

is a PNAF, which implies that there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $J = A^\beta$. Set

$$C_t^z = K_t^z - A_t^\beta, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v].$$

It is clear that the process C^z is continuous. By Remark 4.1, the triple (Y^z, M^z, C^z) is a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{R}}$BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}), f(\mathbf{X}, \cdot) + dA^\mu + dA^\beta, h(\mathbf{X}))$. By [14, Theorem 5.8] there exists a solution v_n of the equation

$$\frac{\partial v_n}{\partial t} + L_t v_n = -f_n(\cdot, v_n) + \mu + \beta.$$

Therefore, by the definition of solution there exists a MAF N^n such that the pair $(v_n(\mathbf{X}), N^n)$ is a solution of BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}), f_n(\mathbf{X}, \cdot) + dA^\mu + dA^\beta)$ under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Let $C_t^n = \int_0^t n(v_n(\mathbf{X}_r) - h(\mathbf{X}_r))^-\, dr$, $t \in [0, \zeta_v]$. By [15, Theorem 2.13] the sequence $\{C^n\}$ converges uniformly on $[0, \zeta_v]$ in probability P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Since C^n is a PCAF for each $n \ge 1$, the process C defined by

$$C_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} C_t^n, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v],$$

is a PCAF. Therefore there exists a measure $\alpha \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $C = A^\alpha$. It is clear that $C^z = A^\alpha$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Finally, $K^z = A^\nu$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, where $\nu = \alpha + \beta$. □

Remark 5.4. Let $v = R^{0,T}\beta$ be such that $v \geq h$ q.e. on $E_{0,T}$. It is an elementary check that

$$v(\mathbf{X}_t) = v(\mathbf{X}_0) - \int_0^t dA_r^\beta + \int_0^t dM_r, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v]$$

for some MAF M. Let $\gamma = -(h(T,\cdot)\cdot m) \otimes \delta_{\{T\}}$. Observe that the function $\bar{v} = E.h(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) + R^{0,T}\gamma + R^{0,T}\beta$ is equal to v on $E_{0,T}$. Moreover, $\bar{v}(X)$ satisfies the same equation as $v(X)$, but on $[0, \zeta_v)$, and $\bar{v}(T,\cdot) \geq h(T,\cdot)$, from which it follows that $\bar{v}(\mathbf{X}_t) \geq h(\mathbf{X}_t)$, $t \in [0, \zeta_v]$.

Proposition 5.5. *Let assumptions* (H1)–(H4) *hold. Assume that $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ and there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $v := R^{0,T}\beta \geq h$ on $E_{0,T}$, and $f^-(\cdot, v)\cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$. Let (u,ν) be a solution of $\underline{\mathrm{O}}\mathrm{P}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h)$. Then $f(\cdot,u)\cdot m_1, \nu \in \mathbb{M}$. If we assume additionally that $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ has the dual Markov property for some $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\varphi \in L^1(E;m)$, $f(\cdot,0)$, $f^-(\cdot,v) \in L^1(E_{0,T};m_1), \beta, \mu \in \mathcal{M}_1$, then $f(\cdot,u) \in L^1(E_{0,T};m_1)$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{M}_1$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mu, \beta, f^-(\cdot,v)\cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$. By [15, Theorem 2.13] (see also Remark 5.4), $\nu \in \mathbb{M}$. By [15, (2.21), (2.22)] we also know that $f(\cdot,u)\cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$, which proves the first part of the theorem. Now assume that $\mu, \beta, f^-(\cdot,v)\cdot m_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$. From the proof of [15, Theorem 2.13] (see [15, (2.21)] and the reasoning preceding [15, (2.21)]) and [14, Theorem 5.8] it follows that there exists a measure $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}_1$ and a solution $\bar{v}$ of

$$-\frac{\partial \bar{v}}{\partial t} - L_t\bar{v} = -f(\cdot,\bar{v}) - \gamma$$

such that $\bar{v} \geq v$ and $v \geq u$. By the construction (thanks to the assumptions we have $\mathcal{M}_1 \subset \mathbb{M}$),

$$\bar{v}(z) = E_z\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} f(\mathbf{X}_r, \bar{v}(\mathbf{X}_r))\,dr + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^\gamma.$$

By [14, Proposition 5.10], $f(\cdot,\bar{v})$, $f(\cdot,u_1), \bar{v}, u_1 \in L^1(E_{0,T};m_1)$. Since $u_1 \leq u \leq \bar{v}$, thanks to (H2) we have $f(\cdot,u) \in L^1(E_{0,T};m_1)$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} u(z) &= E_z\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} f(\mathbf{X}_r, u(\mathbf{X}_r))\,dr + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^\nu + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^\mu \\ &\leq E_z\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} f(\mathbf{X}_r, \bar{v}(\mathbf{X}_r))\,dr + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^\gamma = \bar{v}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^\nu \leq E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} |f(\mathbf{X}_r, u(\mathbf{X}_r))|\,dr + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} |f(\mathbf{X}_r, \bar{v}(\mathbf{X}_r))|\,dr + E_z\int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{|\mu+\gamma|}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. By the above inequality and [14, Proposition 3.13],

$$\|\nu\|_1 \leq c(\|f(\cdot,u)\|_{L^1} + \|f(\cdot,\bar{v})\|_{L^1} + \|\mu\|_1 + \|\nu\|_1),$$

which completes the proof. □

Remark 5.6. Observe that under the assumptions of the second assertion of the above proposition, $u \in L^1(E_{0,T};m_1)$. Moreover, by [14, Proposition 5.10],

$$\|u\|_{L^1} + \|f(\cdot,u)\|_{L^1} \leq c(\|\varphi\|_{L^1} + \|f(\cdot,0)\|_{L^1} + \|\mu\|_1 + \|\nu\|_1).$$

6 PDEs with two reflecting barriers

We assume as given T, φ, f as in Section 5, and quasi-càdlàg functions $h_1, h_2 : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $h_1(T,\cdot) \le \varphi \le h_2(T,\cdot)$.

Definition. We say that a pair (u,ν) consisting of a quasi-càdlàg function $u : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}$ of class (D) and a smooth measure ν on $E_{0,T}$ is a solution of the obstacle problem with data φ, f, μ and barriers h_1, h_2 (we denote it by $\mathrm{OP}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$) if

(a) (1.6) is satisfied for some local MAF M of $\mathbf{M}$,

(b) $h_1 \le u \le u_2$, q.e. on $E_{0,T}$,

(c) $\int (\hat{u} - \hat{h}_1)\, d\nu^+ = \int (\hat{h}_2 - \hat{u})\, d\nu^- = 0$.

Proposition 6.1. *Let assumption* (H1) *hold. Then there exists at most one solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 5.2. The only difference is the estimate of the integral involving dA^ν. In the present situation the estimate is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_t^\tau \mathrm{sgn}(u)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\, dA^\nu_r &\le \int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq 0\}} \frac{1}{|u|}(u_1 - h_1)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\, dA^{\nu_1}_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq 0\}} \frac{1}{|u|}(h_2 - u_2)(\mathbf{X}_{r-})\, dA^{\nu_2}_r \\ &= \int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq 0\}} \frac{1}{|u|}(\hat{u}_1(\mathbf{X}_r) - \hat{h}_1(\mathbf{X}_r))\, dA^{\nu_1}_r \\ &\quad + \int_t^\tau \mathbf{1}_{\{u\neq 0\}} \frac{1}{|u|}(\hat{h}_2(\mathbf{X}_r) - \hat{u}_2(\mathbf{X}_r))\, dA^{\nu_2}_r = 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

Let us consider the following hypothesis:

(H6) h_1, h_2 are quasi-càdlàg functions of class (D) such that $h_1(T,\cdot) \le \varphi \le h_2(T,\cdot)$ and $h_1 < h_2$, $\hat{h}_1 < \hat{h}_2$ q.e. on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$, or there exists $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $h_1 \le R^{0,T}\beta \le h_2$ on $E_{0,T}$.

Remark 6.2. If (H1)–(H4) (H6) are satisfied then the assertion of [15, Theorem 4.2] holds true. It is clear that (H1)–(H4) of [15] are satisfied. If $h_1 < h_2$ and $\hat{h}_1 < \hat{h}_2$ q.e. on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$, then for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$

$$h_1(\mathbf{X}_t) < h_2(\mathbf{X}_t), \quad \hat{h}_1(\mathbf{X}_t) < \hat{h}_2(\mathbf{X}_t), \quad t \in [0, \zeta_\upsilon], \quad P_z\text{a.s.}. \tag{6.1}$$

Since $\mathbf{X}$ has no predictable jumps, it follows from (6.1) and Theorem 3.6 that $h_1(\mathbf{X})_{\tau-} < h_2(\mathbf{X})_{\tau-}$ for every predictable stopping time τ with values in $(0, \zeta_\upsilon]$. By this and [32] the assertion of [15, Theorem 4.2] is satisfied. If $h_1 \le R^{0,T}\beta \le h_2$ on $E_{0,T}$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$, then hypothesis (H7) from [15] is satisfied by Remark 5.4, so again the assertion of [15, Theorem 4.2] holds true.

Theorem 6.3. *Assume that* (H1)–(H4), (H6) *are satisfied. Then there exists a unique solution of* $\mathrm{OP}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$.

Proof. By Remark 6.2 for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$ there exists a solution (Y^z, M^z, R^z) of RBSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_v}), f(\mathbf{X}, \cdot) + dA^\mu, h_1(\mathbf{X}), h_2(\mathbf{X}))$ under the measure P_z. To prove the existence of a solution, it suffices to show that there exists a function u and a smooth measure ν such that $Y^z = u(\mathbf{X})$, $R^z = A^\nu$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, because then the pair (u, ν) will be a solution of OP$(\varphi, f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$. By [15, Theorem 4.1], for every $n \geq 1$ there exists a solution $(\bar{Y}^{n,z}, \bar{M}^{n,z}, \bar{A}^{n,z})$ of $\overline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}), f_n(\mathbf{X}, \cdot) + dA^\mu, h_2(\mathbf{X}))$ with f_n defined by

$$f_n(z, y) = f(z, y) + n(y - h_1(z))^-.$$

By Theorem 5.3,

$$\bar{Y}^{n,z} = \bar{u}_n(\mathbf{X}), \quad \bar{A}^{n,z} = A^{\bar{\gamma}_n}, \tag{6.2}$$

where $(\bar{u}_n, \bar{\gamma}_n)$ is a solution of $\overline{\text{O}}$P$(\varphi, f_n + d\mu, h_2)$. By (6.2), $\bar{M}^{n,z}$ in fact does not depend on z and is a local MAF. By [15, Theorem 4.2],

$$\bar{Y}_t^{n,z} \nearrow Y_t^z, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v].$$

This implies that $\bar{u}_n \leq \bar{u}_{n+1}$ q.e. for $n \geq 1$ and

$$Y_t^z = u(\mathbf{X}_t), \quad t \in [0, \zeta_v]$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, where $u := \sup_{n \geq 1} \bar{u}_n$. By [15, Theorem 4.2], $dA^{\bar{\gamma}_n} \leq dA^{\bar{\gamma}^{n+1}}$, so A defined as $A_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} A_t^{\bar{\gamma}_n}$, $t \geq 0$, is a PNAF. Therefore there exists a positive smooth measure γ such that $A = A^\gamma$. By [15, Theorem 4.2], $A^\gamma = R^{z,-}$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. By Lemma 4.2, without loss of generality we may assume that $E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} d|R^z|_r < \infty$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Observe that the triple $(Y^z, M^z, R^{z,+})$ is a solution of $\underline{\text{O}}$P$(\varphi, f + d\mu + d\gamma, h_1)$. Therefore by Theorem 5.3 there exists a positive smooth measure α such that $R^{z,+} = A^\alpha$ for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, which completes the proof. □

Proposition 6.4. *Let assumptions* (H1)–(H4) *and* (H6) *with some measure* $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$ *hold. Assume that* $f(\cdot, v) \cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$ *with* $v = R^{0,T}\beta$, *and that* $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$. *Then* $f(\cdot, u) \cdot m_1, \nu \in \mathbb{M}$. *If, in addition,* $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ *has the dual Markov property for some* $\gamma \geq 0$ *and* $\varphi \in L^1(E; m), f(\cdot, 0), f(\cdot, v) \in L^1(E_{0,T}; m_1)$, $\mu, \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$, *then* $f(\cdot, u) \in L^1(E_{0,T}, m_1), \nu \in \mathcal{M}_1$.

Proof. If $f(\cdot, v) \cdot m_1, \mu \in \mathbb{M}$, then $\nu \in \mathbb{M}$ by [15, Theorem 3.3] (see also Remark 5.4). Assume that $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ has the dual Markov property for some $\gamma \geq 0$, and that $f(\cdot, 0), f(\cdot, v) \in L^1(E_{0,T}; m_1)$, $\mu, \beta \in \mathcal{M}_1$. By [15, (3.8)] and Theorems 5.3 and 6.3, for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$ we have

$$E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{\nu^-} \leq E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^\gamma,$$

where γ is the second component of the solution of $\overline{\text{O}}$P$(\varphi, f + f^-(\cdot, v) + d\beta^+ d\mu +, h_2)$. By Proposition 5.5, $\gamma \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Hence, by [14, Proposition 3.13], $\nu^- \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Since the pair (u, ν^+) is a solution of $\underline{\text{O}}$P$(\varphi, f + d\mu - d\nu^-, h_1)$, applying Proposition 5.5 yields $\nu^+ \in \mathcal{M}_1$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 6.5. Under (H1)–(H4), (H6) and the assumptions of the second assertion of Proposition 6.4,

$$\|u\|_{L^1} + \|f(\cdot, u)\|_{L^1} \leq c(\|\mu\|_1 + \|\varphi\|_{L^1} + \|\nu\|_1 + \|f(\cdot, 0)\|_{L^1}).$$

This follows from Proposition 6.4 and [14, Proposition 5.10].

Remark 6.6. Let v be a natural potential, i.e. $v = R^{0,T}\beta$ for some $\beta \in \mathbb{M}$. Observe that if a pair $(\bar{u}, \bar{\nu})$ is a solution of $\mathrm{OP}(\varphi, f_v + d\mu - d\beta, h_1 - v, h_2 - v)$ with

$$f_v(z, y) = f(z, v + y),$$

then $(u, \nu) = (\bar{u} + v, \bar{\nu})$ is a solution of $\mathrm{OP}(\varphi, f + d\mu, h_1, h_2)$. It follows that the assumption $f(\cdot, 0) \cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$ in Theorems 5.3 and 6.3 may be replaced by more general assumption saying that there exists a natural potential v such that $f(\cdot, v) \cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$. Similarly, counterparts of the results stated in Propositions 5.5, 6.4 and Remarks 5.6 and 6.5 hold true under the assumption $f(\cdot, v) \cdot m_1 \in \mathbb{M}$. To get appropriate modifications of these results, we first apply them to the pair $(\bar{u}, \bar{\nu})$, and next we use the fact that $(\bar{u}, \bar{\nu}) = (u - v, \nu)$.

7 Switching problem

We first describe informally the switching problem. Precise definitions will be given later on. Consider a factory in which we can change a mode of production. Let $c_{j,i}(X)$ be the cost of the change from mode $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ to mode i from some set $A_j \subset \{1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, N\}$, and let $f^i(X) + dA^{\mu^i}$ be the payoff rate in mode i. Then a management strategy $\mathcal{S} = (\{\tau_n\}, \{\xi_n\})$ consists of a pair of two sequences of random variables. The variable τ_n is the moment when we decide to switch the mode of production, and ξ_n is the mode to which we switch at time τ_n. If $\xi_0 = j$ then we start the production at mode j. If $\xi_0 = j$, then under strategy $\mathcal{S}$ the expected profit on the interval $[0, \zeta_v]$ is given by the formula

$$J(z, \mathcal{S}, j) = E_z\Big(\int_0^{\zeta_v} f^{w^j_r}(\mathbf{X}_r)\, dr + \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA^{\mu^{w^j_r}}_r - \sum_{n \geq 1} c_{w^j_{\tau_{n-1}}, w^j_{\tau_n}}(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_n}) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n < \zeta_v\}} + \varphi^{w^j_{\zeta_v}}(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}) \Big), \tag{7.1}$$

where

$$w^j_t = j \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau_1)}(t) + \sum_{n \geq 1} \xi_n \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n, \tau_{n+1})}(t).$$

The main problem is to find an optimal strategy, i.e. the strategy $\mathcal{S}^*$ such that

$$J(x, \mathcal{S}^*, j) = \sup_{\mathcal{S}} J(x, \mathcal{S}, j).$$

In this section we show that $\mathcal{S}^*$ exists and $\mathcal{S}^*$, $J(z, \mathcal{S}^*, j)$ are determined by a solution of the system (1.14)–(1.16).

7.1 Systems of BSDEs with oblique reflection

In what follows $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $\xi = (\xi^1, \dots, \xi^N)$ is an $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable random vector, $V = (V^1, \dots, V^N)$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process such that $V_0 = 0$ and each component V^j is a càdlàg process of finite variation, $f : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is a measurable function such that for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the process $f(\cdot, y)$ is $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable. Consider a family $\{h_{j,i}; i, j = 1, \dots, N\}$ of measurable functions $h_{j,i} : \Omega \times [0, T] \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$

such that $h_{j,i}(\cdot, y^i)$ is progressively measurable for every $y \in \mathbb{R}$. For given sets $A_j \subset \{1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, N\}$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, we set

$$H^j(t,y) = \max_{i \in A_j} h_{j,i}(t, y_i), \quad H(t,y) = (H^1(t,y), \dots, H^N(t,y)), \quad t \in [0,T],\, y \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We consider the following system of BSDEs with oblique reflection:

$$\begin{cases} Y_t^j = \xi^j + \int_t^T f^j(r, Y_r)\, dr + \int_t^T dV_r + \int_t^T dK_r^j - \int_t^T dM_r^j, \quad t \in [0,T], \\ Y_t^j \geq \max_{i \in A_j} h_{ji}(t, Y_t^i), \quad t \in [0,T], \\ \int_0^T (Y_{t-}^j - [H^j(\cdot, Y)]_{t-})\, dK_t^j = 0,\ j = 1, \dots, N. \end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

Definition. We say that a triple (Y, M, K) of adapted càdlàg processes is a solution of BSDE with oblique reflection (7.2) if Y is of class (D), M is a local martingale with $M_0 = 0$, K is an increasing process with $K_0 = 0$ and (7.2) is satisfied.

If $A_j = \emptyset$, then by convention, $H^j = -\infty$, so Y^j has no lower barrier. We then take $K^j = 0$ in the above definition.

7.2 Systems of quasi-variational inequalities

Fix $N \geq 1$. Let μ^j,$j = 1, \dots, N$, be smooth measures on $E_{0,T}$, and let $\varphi^j : E \to \mathbb{R}$, $f^j : \bar{E}_{0,T} \times \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$, $h_{j,i} : \bar{E}_{0,T} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, be measurable functions. We set

$$f^j(z, y; a) = f^j(z, y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, a, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_N), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^N,\, a \in \mathbb{R},$$

and for given sets $A_j \subset \{1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, N\}$, $j = 1, \dots, N$, we set

$$H^j(z,y) = \max_{i \in A_j} h_{j,i}(z, y_i), \quad H(z,y) = (H^1(z,y), \dots, H^N(z,y)), \quad z \in \bar{E}_{0,T},\, y \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

We adopt the convention that the maximum over the empty set equals $-\infty$. Consequently, if $A_j = \emptyset$ for some j, then $H^j(z,y) = -\infty$.

Set

$$\varphi = (\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^N), \quad f = (f^1, \dots, f^N), \quad \mu = (\mu^1, \dots, \mu^N),$$

and consider the following system of equations:

$$-\frac{\partial u^j}{\partial t} - L_t u^j = f^j(t,x,u) + \mu^j \quad \text{in } E_{0,T}, \quad u^j(T, \cdot) = \varphi^j \quad \text{on } E \tag{7.3}$$

for $j = 1. \dots, N$. In the sequel we denote (7.3) by PDE$(\varphi, f + d\mu)$.

Definition. We say that measurable function $u = (u^1, \dots, u^N) : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is a subsolution (resp. supersolution) of PDE$(\varphi, f + d\mu)$ if there exist positive measures $\beta^j \in \mathbb{M}$ and $\underline{\varphi} \leq \varphi$, $\underline{\varphi} \cdot m \otimes \delta_{\{T\}} \in \mathbb{M}$ (resp. $\overline{\varphi} \geq \varphi$, $\overline{\varphi} \cdot m \otimes \delta_{\{T\}} \in \mathbb{M}$) such that u^j is a solution of PDE$(\underline{\varphi}^j, f^j + d\mu^j - d\beta^j)$ (resp. PDE$(\overline{\varphi}^j, f^j + d\mu^j + d\beta^j)$), $j = 1, \dots, N$.

Definition. We say that a quasi-càdlàg function $u = (u^1, \dots, u^N) : \bar{E}_{0,T} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ is a solution of (1.14)–(1.16) if there exist positive measures $\nu^j \in \mathbb{M}$ such that u is a solution of PDE$(\varphi, f + d\mu + d\nu)$ with $\nu = (\nu^1, \dots, \nu^N)$, and (1.15), (1.16) are satisfied.

Let us consider the following hypotheses:

(A1) $\mu, \varphi \cdot m \otimes \delta_{\{T\}} \in \mathbb{M}$,

(A2) for $j = 1, \dots, N$ the function is $a \mapsto f^j(x, y; a)$ is nonincreasing for all $z \in E_{0,T}$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$,

(A3) f is off-diagonal nondecreasing, i.e. for $j = 1, \dots, N$ we have $f^j(z, y) \le f^j(z, \bar{y})$ for all $y, \bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $y \le \bar{y}$ and $y^j = \bar{y}^j$,

(A4) $y \mapsto f(z, y)$ is continuous for every $z \in E_{0,T}$,

(A5) $f^j(\cdot, y) \in qL^1(E_{0,T}; m)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $j = 1, \dots, N$,

(A6) there exists a subsolution $\underline{u}$ and a supersolution $\overline{u}$ of PDE$(\varphi, f + d\mu)$ such that

$$\underline{u} \le \overline{u}, \quad H(\cdot, \overline{u}) \le \overline{u}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} |f^j(\cdot, \overline{u})| + |f^j(\cdot, \underline{u}; \overline{u}^j)| \in \mathbb{M},$$

(A7) H^j is continuous on $\bar{E}_{0,T} \times \mathbb{R}^N$ with the product topology consisting of quasi-topology on $\bar{E}_{0,T}$ and Euclidean topology on $\mathbb{R}^N$, and $h_{j,i}$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$, are nondecreasing with respect to the second variable.

Theorem 7.1. *Let assumptions* (A1)–(A7) *hold. Then there exists a minimal solution of* (1.14)–(1.16) *such that* $\underline{u} \le u \le \overline{u}$.

Proof. First observe that the data $f(\mathbf{X}, \cdot), H^j(\mathbf{X}, \cdot), \xi := \varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}), \underline{Y} := \underline{u}(\mathbf{X}), \overline{Y} := \overline{u}(\mathbf{X})$ satisfy the assumptions of [17, Theorem 3.11] under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Set $u_0 = \underline{u}$ and $Y^0 = \underline{Y}$. By Theorem 5.3, for every $n \ge 1$,

$$u_n^j(X_t) = Y_t^{n,j}, \quad A_t^{\nu_n} = K_t^{n,j},$$

where (u_n^j, ν_n^j) is a solution of OP$(f^j(\mathbf{X}, u_{n-1}; \cdot) + \mu^j, H^j(\cdot, u_{n-1}))$ and $(Y^{n,j}, K^{n,j}, M^{n,j})$ is a solution of $\underline{\text{R}}$BSDE$(\xi^j, f^j(\cdot, Y^{n-1}; \cdot) + dV, H^j(\cdot, Y^{n-1}))$. By [17, Theorem 3.11], $Y^n \le Y^{n+1}$. Hence $u_n \le u_{n+1}$ q.e. Set now $u = \sup_{n \ge 0} u_n$. Then from the proof of [17, Theorem 3.11] it follows that

$$u(\mathbf{X}_t) = Y_t, \quad t \in [0, \zeta \wedge a], \quad a \ge 0,$$

where (Y, M, K) is a minimal solution of (7.2) such that $\underline{Y} \le Y \le \overline{Y}$. Write $v_n^j(z) = E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{\nu_n^j}$, $z \in E_{0,T}$. Then v_n^j is a potential. From the proof of [17, Theorem 3.11] it follows that $\{v_n^j\}$ is convergent. Therefore v^j defined by $v^j = \lim_{n \to \infty} v_n^j$ is an excessive function. Observe that v^j is dominated by the function $z \mapsto |\overline{u}(z)| + E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} |f(\mathbf{X}_r, u(\mathbf{X}_r))|\, dr + E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{|\mu|}$. The second and the third term of this sum is a potential. Moreover, since $\bar{u}$ is a supersolution, $|\overline{u}|$ is dominated by a potential. Consequently, v is a potential, so by [2, Theorem IV.3.13] there exists a PNAF A such that $v(z) = E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r$, $z \in E_{0,T}$. By [25] there exists a measure $\nu \in \mathbb{M}$ such that $A = A^\nu$. It is clear that $A^\nu = K$, which implies that the pair (u, ν) is a solution of (1.14)–(1.16). Minimality of u follows from minimality of Y. □

Remark 7.2. Assume that $\mathcal{E}_\gamma$ has the dual Markov property for some $\gamma \ge 0$ and assumptions (A1), (A6), are satisfied with $\mathbb{M}$ replaced by $\mathcal{M}_1$. Also assume that the

measures β^j appearing in the definition of the supersolution $\overline{u}$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}_1$. Let (u,ν) be a solution of (1.14)–(1.16). Then $\nu^j \in \mathcal{M}_1$, $j=1,\dots,N$. Indeed, since $u \le \overline{u}$,

$$E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{|\nu|} \le E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} |f(r,u(\mathbf{X}_r))|\,dr + E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} |f(\mathbf{X}_r,\overline{u}(\mathbf{X}_r))|\,dr$$
$$+ 2E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA^{|\mu|} + E_z \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{|\beta|}$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. From the above inequality and [14, Proposition 3.13] it follows that

$$\|\nu\|_{TV} \le \|f(\cdot,u)\|_{L^1} + \|f(\cdot,\overline{u})\|_{L^1} + 2\|\mu\|_1 + \|\beta\|_1.$$

We have assumed that $\|f(\cdot,\overline{u})\|_{L^1} + \|\mu\|_1 + \|\beta\|_1 < \infty$. Furthermore, by (A2), (A3), (A6), $\|f(\cdot,u)\|_{L^1} < \infty$. This proves that $\|\nu\|_{TV} < \infty$.

Let us consider the following hypothesis:

(A8) there exists a subsolution $\underline{u}$ and a supersolution $\overline{u}$ of PDE$(\varphi, f+d\mu)$ and a natural potential $v=(v^1,\dots,v^N)$ such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^N (|f^j(\cdot,\overline{u};v^j)| + |f^j(\cdot,\underline{u};v^j)|) \in \mathbb{M}.$$

Proposition 7.3. *Let assumptions* (A1)–(A5), (A8) *hold. Then there exists minimal solution u of* PDE$(\varphi, f+d\mu)$ *such that $\underline{u} \le u \le \overline{u}$.*

Proof. Observe that $f(\mathbf{X},\cdot)$, $\underline{Y} := \underline{u}(\mathbf{X})$, $\overline{Y} := \overline{u}(\mathbf{X})$, $S = v(\mathbf{X})$ (see Remark 5.1), $V = A^\mu$, $\xi := \varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v})$ satisfy the assumptions of [17, Theorem 2.12] under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$. Set $u_0 = \underline{u}$. By [14, Theorem 5.8], $Y^{n,j} = u_n^j(\mathbf{X})$, where u_n^j is a solution of PDE$(\varphi, f^j(\cdot,u_{n-1};\cdot) + d\mu^j)$ and $(Y^{n,j}, M^{n,j})$ is a solution of BSDE$(\xi^j, f^j(\mathbf{X},Y^{n-1};\cdot) + dV^j)$, $j=1,\dots,N$. From the proof of [17, Theorem 2.12] it follows that $Y^n \le Y^{n+1}$. Hence $u_n \le u_{n+1}$ q.e. Set $u = \sup_{n\ge1} u_n$. Then from the proof of [17, Theorem 2.12] it follows that $Y = u(\mathbf{X})$, where Y is minimal solution of BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}), f(\mathbf{X},\cdot) + dA^\mu)$ such that $\underline{u}(\mathbf{X}) \le Y \le \overline{u}(\mathbf{X})$. Hence u is the minimal solution of PDE$(\varphi, f+d\mu)$ such that $\underline{u} \le u \le \overline{u}$. □

Theorem 7.4. *Assume* (A1)–(A8). *Then there exists minimal solution u_n of the system*

$$-\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial t} - L_t u_n^j = f^j(\cdot,u_n) + n(u_n^j - H^j(\cdot,u_n))^- + \mu \tag{7.4}$$

such that $\underline{u} \le u_n \le \overline{u}$. Moreover, $u_n \nearrow u$ q.e., where u is minimal solution of (1.14)–(1.16) *such that $\underline{u} \le u \le \overline{u}$.*

Proof. Observe that $\overline{u}$ is a supersolution of (7.4), and $\underline{u}$ is a subsolution of (7.4). Moreover, (A8) for (7.4) is satisfied with $v = \overline{u}$. By Proposition 7.3 there exists a minimal solution u_n of (7.4). By the definition and construction of minimal solution to (7.4) and BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}), f_n(\mathbf{X},\cdot) + dA^\mu)$ (see [17, Theorem 2.12] and Proposition 7.3), $u_n(\mathbf{X})$ is the first component of minimal solution of BSDE$(\varphi(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v}), f_n(\mathbf{X},\cdot) + dA^\mu)$ with $f_n^j(z,y) = f^j(z,y) + n(y^j - H^j(z,y))^-$. By [17, Theorem 3.15], the sequence $\{u_n(\mathbf{X})\}$ is nondecreasing and $u_n(\mathbf{X}) \nearrow Y$ under the measure P_z for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, where Y is the first component of the solution of (7.2). From the proof of Theorem 7.1 it follows that $Y = u(\mathbf{X})$, where (u,ν) is the minimal solution of (1.14)–(1.16) such that $\underline{u} \le u \le \overline{u}$. Of course, this implies that $u_n \nearrow u$ q.e. □

7.3 Value function for the switching problem

In what follows we assume that H^j are of the form

$$H^j(z,y) = \max_{i\in A_j}(-c_{j,i}(z) + y^i), \tag{7.5}$$

where $c_{j,i}$ are quasi-continuous functions on $E_{0,T}$ such that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$c_{j,i}(z) \geq c, \quad z \in E_{0,T}, \quad i \in A_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, N.$$

By a strategy we call a pair $\mathcal{S} = (\{\xi_n\}, \{\tau_n\})$ consisting of a sequence $\{\tau_n, n \geq 1\}$ of increasing $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times such that

$$P_z(\tau_n < \zeta_v, \forall\ n \geq 1) = 0$$

for q.e. $z \in E_{0,T}$, and a sequence $\{\xi_n, n \geq 1\}$ of random variables taking values in $\{1, \dots, N\}$ such that ξ_n is $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}$-measurable for each $n \geq 1$. The set of all strategies we denote by $\mathbf{A}$. For $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{A}$ we set

$$w_t^j = j\mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau_1)}(t) + \sum_{n\geq 1} \xi_n \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n,\tau_{n+1})}(t).$$

Remark 7.5. In Theorem 7.3 assume additionally that $\mu \in \mathbb{M}_c$, $h_{j,i}$ are strictly increasing with respect to y, and that the following condition considered in [10] is satisfied:

(A9) there are no $(y_1, \dots, y_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $j_2 \in A_{j_1}, \dots, j_k \in A_{j_{k-1}}, j_1 \in A_{j_k}$ such that

$$y_1 = h_{j_1,j_2}(z, y_2), y_2 = h_{j_2,j_3}(z, y_3), \dots, y_{k-1} = h_{j_{k-1},j_k}(z, y_k), y_k = h_{j_k,j_1}(z, y_1).$$

Then $\nu \in \mathbb{M}_c$ and u is quasi-continuous. This follows from [17, Remark 3.14]. Observe that (A9) is satisfied for $h_{j,i}$ defined by (7.5).

Theorem 7.6. *Assume that f does not depend on y, the functions H^j are of the form (7.5) and $f^j \cdot m_1, \mu^j \in \mathbb{M}$, $j = 1, \dots, N$. Then there exists a unique solution u of (1.14)–(1.16). Moreover,*

$$u^j(z) = \sup_{\mathcal{S}\in\mathbf{A}} J(z, \mathcal{S}, j)$$

and

$$u^j(z) = E_z\Big(\int_0^{\zeta_v} f^{w_r^{j,*}}(\mathbf{X}_r)\, dr + \int_0^{\zeta_v} dA_r^{\mu^{w_r^{j,*}}} - \sum_{n\geq 1} c_{w^{j,*}_{\tau_{n-1}}, w^{j,*}_{\tau_n}}(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_n})\mathbf{1}_{\{\tau_n<\zeta_v\}} + \varphi^{w^{j,*}_{\zeta_v}}(\mathbf{X}_{\zeta_v})\Big),$$

where

$$w^{j,*} = j\mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau_1^{j,*})}(t) + \sum_{n\geq 1} \xi_n^{j,*} \mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n^{j,*},\tau_{n+1}^{j,*})}(t)$$

and

$$\tau_0^{j,*} = 0, \quad \tau_k^{j,*} = \inf\{t \geq \tau_{k-1}^{j,*} : u^{\xi_{k-1}^{j,*}}(\mathbf{X}_t) = H^{\xi_{k-1}^{j,*}}(\mathbf{X}_t, u(\mathbf{X}_t))\} \wedge \zeta_v, \quad k \geq 1,$$

$$\xi_0^{j,*} = j, \quad \xi_k^{j,*} = \max\{i;\ H^{\xi_{k-1}^{j,*}}(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_k}, u(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_k})) = -c_{\xi_{k-1}^{j,*},i}(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_k}) + u^i(\mathbf{X}_{\tau_k})\}, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Proof. Follows from Proposition 7.3, Remark 7.5 and [17, Theorem 4.3]. □

References

[1] Bensoussan, A., Lions, J.-L.: Applications of variational inequalities in stochastic vontrol. North-Holland, Amsterdam, (1982)

[2] Blumenthal, M.R., Getoor, R.K.: Markov processes and potential theory. Dover Publications, New York (2007)

[3] Dal Maso, G., Murat, F., Orsina, L., Prignet, A.: Renormalized solutions of elliptic equations with general measure data. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **28** (4), 741–808 (1999)

[4] Dellacherie, C., Meyer, P.-A.: Probabilities and Potential. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam (1978)

[5] Djehiche B., Hamadène S., Popier, A.: , The finite horizon optimal multiple switching problem. SIAM J. Control Optim. **48** (4), 2751–2770 (2009)

[6] El Asri, B., Hamadène, S.: The finite horizon optimal multi-modes switching problem: The viscosity solution approach. Appl. Math. Optim. **60**, 213-235 (2009)

[7] Getoor, R.K., Sharpe, M.J.: Naturality, standardness, and weak duality for Markov processes. Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete **67**, 1–62 (1984)

[8] Hamadène, S., Jeanblanc, M.: On the starting and stopping problem: application in reversible investments Math. Oper. Res. **32**, 182–192 (2007)

[9] Hamadène, S., Morlais, M.A.: Viscosity solutions of systems of PDEs with interconnected obstacles and multi-modes switching problem. arXiv:1104.2689v2.

[10] Hamadène, S., Zhang, J.: Switching problem and related system of reflected backward SDEs. Stochastic Process. Appl. **120**, 403–426 (2010)

[11] Hu, Y., Tang, S.: Multi-dimensional BSDE with oblique reflection and optimal switching. Probab. Theory Related Fields **147**, 89–121 (2010)

[12] Klimsiak, T.: Reflected BSDEs and the obstacle problem for semilinear PDEs in divergence form. Stochastic Process. Appl. **122**, 134–169 (2012)

[13] Klimsiak, T.: Cauchy problem for semilinear parabolic equation with time-dependent obstacles: a BSDEs approach. Potential Anal. **39**, 99–140 (2013)

[14] Klimsiak, T.: Semi-Dirichlet forms, Feynman-Kac functionals and the Cauchy problem for semilinear parabolic equations. J. Funct. Anal. **268**, 1205–1240 (2015)

[15] Klimsiak, T.: Reflected BSDEs on filtered probability spaces. Stochastic Process. Appl. **125**, 4204–4241 (2015)

[16] Klimsiak, T.: Reduced measures for semilinear elliptic equations involving Dirichlet operators. Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55**, no. 4, Paper No. 78, 27 pp. (2016)

[17] Klimsiak, T.: Systems of quasi-variational inequalities related to the switching problem. arXiv:1609.02221v2 (2016)

[18] Klimsiak, T., Rozkosz, A.: Dirichlet forms and semilinear elliptic equations with measure data. J. Funct. Anal. **265**, 890–925 (2013)

[19] Klimsiak, T., Rozkosz, A.: Obstacle problem for semilinear parabolic equations with measure data. J. Evol. Equ. **15**, 457–491 (2015)

[20] Klimsiak, T., Rozkosz, A.: Renormalized solutions of semilinear equations involving measure data and operator corresponding to Dirichlet form. NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. **22**, 1911–1934 (2015)

[21] Lenglart, E.; Lépingle, D.; Pratelli, M. Présentation unifiée de certaines inégalités de la théorie des martingales. (French) With an appendix by Lenglart. Lecture Notes in Math. **784**, Seminar on Probability, XIV (Paris, 1978/1979) pp. 26–52, Springer, Berlin, 1980.

[22] Lundström, N., Nyström, K., Olofsson, M.: Systems of variational inequalities for non-local operators related to optimal switching problems: existence and uniqueness. Manuscripta Math. **145**, 407–432 (2014)

[23] Lundström, N. Nyström, K. Olofsson, M.: Systems of variational inequalities in the context of optimal switching problems and operators of Kolmogorov type. Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **193**, 1213–1247 (2014)

[24] Mignot, F., Puel, J.P.: Inéquations d'evolution paraboliques avec convexes dépendant du temps. Applications aux inéquations quasi-variationnelles d'évolution. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **64**, 59–91 (1977)

[25] Oshima Y.: Semi-Dirichlet forms and Markov processes. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin (2013)

[26] Oshima, Y.: Some properties of Markov processes associated with time dependent Dirichlet forms. Osaka J. Math. **29**, 103–127 (1992)

[27] Peng, S.: Monotonic Limit Theorem of BSDE and Nonlinear Decomposition Theorem of Doob-Meyers Type. Probab. Theory Related Fields **113**, 473–499 (1999)

[28] Petitta, F., Ponce, A.C., Porretta, A.: Diffuse measures and nonlinear parabolic equations. J. Evol. Equ. **11**, 861–905 (2011)

[29] Pierre, M.: Problemes d'evolution avec contraintes unilatérales et potentiel paraboliques. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **4**, 1149–1197 (1979)

[30] Pierre, M.: Representant precis d'un potentiel parabolique. Seminaire de Theorie du Potentiel, Paris, No. 5, Lecture Notes in Math. **814**, 186–228 (1980)

[31] Stannat, W.: The theory of generalized Dirichlet forms and its applications in analysis and stochastics. Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **142**, no. 678, viii+101 pp. (1999)

[32] M. Topolewski, Reflected BSDEs with general filtration and two completely separated barriers. arXiv:1611.06745 (2016)